

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-7, 13-14 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sims et al. (5,434,775) in view of Bates (6,057,779).

The Examiner rejected claims 3-5, 15-17 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sims et al. (5,434,775) and Bates (6,057,779) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Guthrie et al. (5,289,372).

The Examiner rejected claims 8-12 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sims et al. (5,434,775) in view of Bates (6,057,779) and Guthrie et al. (5,289,372).

Applicant respectfully traverses the §101 and §103 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner states: "The recited steps ... does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper."

In response, Applicant respectfully contends that recitation of "recording ... in an electronic database" in claims 1-12 cannot be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper.

Based on the preceding argument, Applicant maintains that claims 1-12 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 6-7, 13-14 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sims et al. (5,434,775) in view of Bates (6,057,779).

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 1, 13, and 24 are not unpatentable over Sims in view of Bates, because Sims in view of Bates does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1, 13, and 24. For example, Sims in view of Bates does not teach or suggest the feature: "each asset of said assets being independently selected from the group consisting of a computer hardware asset and a computer software asset". As another example, Sims in view of Bates does not teach or suggest the feature: "said assets being moveable between a plurality of sites only by being routed through said central site and not being moveable directly from a first site to a second site of the plurality of sites".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that claims 1, 13, and 24 are not unpatentable over Sims in view of Bates, and that claims 1, 13, and 24 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 3-4 and 7 depend from claim 1, Applicant contends that claims 3-4 and 7 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 15-16 depend from claim 13, Applicant contends that claims 15-16 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claim 25 depends from claim 24, Applicant contends that claim 25 is likewise in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejected claims 8-12 and 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sims et al. (5,434,775) in view of Bates (6,057,779) and Guthrie et al. (5,289,372).

Applicant respectfully contends that claims 8 and 18 are not unpatentable over Sims in

view of Bates and Guthrie, because Sims in view of Bates and Guthrie does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 8 and 18. For example, Sims in view of Bates and Guthrie does not teach or suggest the feature: "each asset of said assets being independently selected from the group consisting of a computer hardware asset and a computer software asset". As another example, Sims in view of Bates and Guthrie does not teach or suggest the feature: "said assets being moveable between a plurality of sites only by being routed through said central site and not being moveable directly from a first site to a second site of the plurality of sites".

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully maintains that claims 8 and 18 are not unpatentable over Sims in view of Bates and Guthrie, and that claims 8 and 18 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 9-10 depend from claim 8, Applicant contends that claims 9-10 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 20-22 depend from claim 18, Applicant contends that claims 20-22 are likewise in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 09/01/2004

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

09/657,039

15